REMARKS

The claims remaining in the present application are Claims 1-23.

35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-3, 5-17, and 19-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being

anticipated by Kleinsorge et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,247,109 (hereinafter,

Kleinsorge). The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons below.

> Claim 1 recites:
>> A system having a partitioned memory, said system comprising:
>> a processor;
>> a hardware implemented memory router coupled to said
> processor;
>> memory coupled to said memory router;
>> said memory router configured to store memory partition
> information, said information describing the memory allocated to said
> processor; and
>> said memory router operable to map a memory access request
> having an address from said processor to an address in said memory
> allocated to said processor.

Claim 1 recites a limitation of "a hardware implemented memory router."

Anticipation requires the presence in a single prior art reference disclosure

of each and every element of the claimed invention, arranged as in the

claim (Lindemann Maschinefabrik GmbH v. American Hoist & Derrick

Co., 221 USPQ 481, 485 (Fed. Cir. 1984)). Applicants respectfully submit that

Kleinsorge fails to disclose each and every element of Claim 1, arranged as

in the claim. For example, Applicants respectfully submit that Kleinsorge

fails to disclose the claimed limitation "a <u>hardware implemented</u> memory

router." Thus, Kleinsorge also fails to disclose a (hardware implemented)

memory router configured to store memory partition information, as

claimed. Moreover, Kleinsorge fails to disclose a (hardware implemented)

memory router operable to map a memory access request having an address from a processor to an address in memory allocated to said processor, as claimed.

In contrast, Kleinsorge discloses a method that is best described as software implemented with respect to routing memory requests. For example, in the "Summary of the Invention" Kleinsorge emphasizes the software control of the system. [R]esources [are] adaptively subdivided by software. This partitioning, which a system manager directs, is a software function (col. 4, lines 59-61).

At col. 8, lines 41-46 Kleinsorge provides further details indicating that Kleinsorge does not have a hardware implemented memory router, as claimed. Kleinsorge discloses the construction of a configuration tree in memory, which represents all the hardware in the system. The tree contains all the software partitioning information, and the assignments of the hardware to partitions. Moreover, Kleinsorge discloses that a console program implements and enforces configuration constraints (col. 12, lines 5-6). Thus, Kleinsorge has software implemented routing, according to Applicants understanding.

For the foregoing rationale, Claim 1 is not anticipated by Kleinsorge. As such, allowance of Claim 1 is respectfully solicited.

Claims 14 and 21 also recite limitations directed to a hardware implemented memory router. For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, Claims 14 and 21 are not anticipated by Kleinsorge.

Claims 2-3, 5-13, 15-17, 19-20, and 22-23 depend from Claims 1, 14, and 21, which are believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. As such, Claims 2-3, 5-13, 15-17, 19-20, and 22-23 are believed to be allowable and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 4 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Kleinsorge. The rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons below.

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, the limitations of Claim 1 are neither taught nor suggested by Kleinsorge. Thus, Claim 1 is not rendered obvious over Kleinsorge. As Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, Claim 4 is not rendered obvious over Kleinsorge.

For the reasons discussed in the response to Claim 1, the limitations of Claim 14 are neither taught nor suggested by Kleinsorge. Thus, Claim 14 is not rendered obvious over Kleinsorge. As Claim 18 depends from Claim 14, Claim 18 is not rendered obvious over Kleinsorge.

As such, Claims 4 and 18 are believed to be allowable and their allowance is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-23 overcome the rejections of record. Therefore, allowance of Claims 1-23 is respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner have a question regarding the instant amendment and response, the Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the below listed telephone number.

Dated: ___9/2___, 2003

Respectfully submitted,
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Ronald M Pomerenke
Ronald M. Pomerenke
Registration No. 43,009

Address: WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113

Telephone: (408) 938-9060 Voice
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile